

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-45 are pending in this application. Claims 18-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,625,757 to Kageyama et al. (herein "Kageyama") in view of U.S. patent 5,603,060 to Weinberger et al. (herein "Weinberger"). Claims 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 31, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,768,516 to Sugishima in view of Weinberger. Claims 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sugishima in view of Weinberger as applied to claims 18 and 26, and further in view of U.S. patent 5,991,846 to Ooki. Claims 34-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kageyama in view of Weinberger. Claims 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sugishima in view of Weinberger. Claims 35, 38, 41, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sugishima in view of Weinberger as applied to claims 34, 37, 40, and 43, and further in view of Ooki.

Addressing now each of the outstanding rejections, each of the outstanding rejections is traversed by the present response.

Applicants initially note that each of the claims is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent Claim 1 now further recites "said computer configured to select one of said plurality of image forming apparatuses to which an operator sends a print instruction based on the information items displayed on the computer display" (emphasis added). Each of the other independent claims is also amended by the present response to particularly clarify an operator or user sending a print instruction, to recite similar limitations as in independent Claim 18 noted above. Such subject matter is fully supported by the original specification for example at page 19, line 5 et seq.

The above-noted claim amendments are believed to clarify distinctions between the claimed invention and the teachings in the applied art, and particularly the teachings in Weinberger as Weinberger is cited to disclose a system “that allows a user to access a functional replica of the operation panel of copiers from a remote location, wherein a copy of the control panel information is maintained at a data collection computer (which reads on a server) (16) (column 3, lines 24-54)”.¹

However, in that respect applicants note that Weinberger does not teach or suggest that a user from a remote location can input a *print instruction* to execute a printing operation.

That is, in the claimed system the operator can enter a print command while monitoring information items of the printer on a network. Weinberger, however, is not directed to a device with such an operation.

More particularly, Weinberger is directed to a remote monitoring system of a copying machine in which an operator at a central data collection point 4 can guide an operation to a client at a user site by seeing an operation panel of the copying machine on the computer 16. Weinberger notes at column 13, lines 40-49 that allowing a remote key operator to view an actual representation of any copier 2 “allows an experienced person to view actual machine conditions first hand and also allows them to guide a less experienced individual at the remote machine site”,² and provides the additional benefit “that a person in a totally separate facility or town via a modem telephone link can view the actual status panel of a copier 2 to suggest possible solutions to a problem”.³ As clear from the above description Weinberger does not disclose or suggest that the operator at the remote site can input a print instruction to thereby have one of the copiers execute a print operation. Thus, Weinberger is not related to

¹ Office Action of March 3, 2004, page 3, lines 13-16.

² Weinberger specifically at column 13, lines 42-45.

³ Weinberger specifically at column 13, lines 46-49.

an apparatus that can transmit a print instruction from the noted operator over a network as in Weinberger the operator does not enter a print instruction to be directed to a copier at a user site.


In such ways, applicants respectfully submit that no combination of teachings of Kageyama in view of Weinberger fully meets the limitations now clarified in each of the pending claims.

Further, no teachings in any of the further cited references are believed to overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Kageyama in view of Weinberger.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)
SNS/rac

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423